

EXHIBIT A

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

LAURENCE & STARK

BOARD OF EXAMINERS FOR NURSING

IN RE:

Jeanne Surprenant, RN #R1714652 Red Bridge RoadNo. Grosvenordale, CT 06255MEMORANDUM OF DECISIONINTRODUCTION

The Board of Examiners for Nursing, (hereafter the "Board"), was presented by the Department of Health Services with a Statement of Charges dated November 7, 1984.

The Statement of Charges alleged violations of certain provisions of Chapter 378, Connecticut General Statutes. The Board issued a Notice of Hearing which provided that the hearing would take place on November 28, 1984 in the State Armory at 360 Broad Street, Hartford, Connecticut.

Each member of the Board involved in this decision attests that she has reviewed the record, and that this decision is based entirely on the record.

FACTS

Based on the testimony given and the exhibits offered into evidence at the above hearing, the Board made the following findings of fact:

1. Jeanne Surprenant, respondent, was at all pertinent times licensed to practice nursing as a registered nurse in Connecticut, with registration number R 17146.
2. Pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes, Section 4-182(c), the respondent was provided a full opportunity prior to the institution of agency action to show compliance with all the terms for the retention of her license.
3. The respondent: a) on or about June 3, 1982, while she was Director of Nursing at Norcliff Rest Home, directed the nursing staff under her supervision to alter the medical record of patient Ernestine Smith; this was done by the respondent's own admission to provide more documentation of the patient's status in relationship to Valium administration; the notes were not marked as non-originals; b) On or about March, 1982, while she was Director of Nursing at Norcliff Rest Home, failed to indicate destruction of an original controlled substance sheet upon a copy of said sheet and failed to obtain a co-signature on such sheet; this was done when recopying a Robitussin A.C. receipt record for a patient by the name of Mr. A. Price; there was no designation on the receipt record that it was a copy, nor was it co-signed.

-3-

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

4. The First Count alleges that on or about March 21, 1982, the respondent violated provisions of Section 20-99(b) while recopying a Robitussin A.C. receipt record for patient A. Price by inaccurately and/or incompetently documenting the disposition of this controlled substance. Although the doctor's order was for 1 dram (5 cc's), on some occasions 10 cc's were recorded as given by staff on the recopied receipt record. Due to the unavailability of the original document the Board could not determine whether or not the wrong dose had been given, or whether the wrong amount had been recorded on the original document, or whether the respondent had inaccurately and/or incompetently documented the disposition of the Robitussin A.C. while recopying the receipt record.

In pertinent part, Section 20-99(b) forbids incompetence or negligence in carrying out usual nursing functions.

Based on the foregoing, the Board determined that insufficient evidence was presented to find the respondent as charged in the First Count.

5. The Second Count alleges that the respondent violated provisions of Section 20-99(b) while she was Director of Nursing at Norcliff Rest Home, Brooklyn, Connecticut during the period from approximately March to June, 1982; she allegedly directed two nurses under her supervision to administer Valium to psychiatric patients at specified times rather than according to the physician's order and against the nurses' judgment.

In pertinent part, Section 20-99(b) forbids illegal conduct, incompetence or negligence in carrying out usual nursing functions.

The Board determined that insufficient evidence was presented to find the respondent as charged in the Second Count.

6. The Third Count alleges that on or about June 3, 1982, the respondent, while Director of Nursing at Norcliff Rest Home, violated provisions of section 20-99(b) by directing the nursing staff under her supervision to alter the medical record of patient Ernestine Smith.

The Board determined that the alleged conduct had occurred. According to the respondent's own admission this was done to provide more documentation of the patient's status in relationship to Valium administration. The notes were not marked as non- originals. A notation by a staff nurse was crossed out by the respondent but the source of this altering was not indicated on the record.

In pertinent part, Section 20-99(b) forbids incompetence or negligence in carrying out usual nursing functions.

Standards of nursing practice require accurate record keeping on all patients and prohibit altering records without accurate documentation of the source of any change in records. The respondent acted negligently and incompetently.

Based on the foregoing, the Board concludes that the respondent has violated Section 20-99(b) as specified in the Third Count.

7. The Fourth Count alleges that the respondent violated provisions of Section 20-99(b) on or about May 12, 1982, while Director of Nursing at Norcliff Rest Home in Brooklyn, Connecticut by destroying a doctor's order sheet; the patient's record to which the order sheet allegedly belonged was Claire Gagnon.

In pertinent part, Section 20-99(b) forbids illegal conduct, incompetence or negligence in carrying out usual nursing functions.

The Board determined that insufficient evidence was presented to find the respondent as charged in the Fourth Count.

8. The Fifth Count alleges that on or about March 1982, the respondent violated provisions of Section 20-99(b) while recopying a Robitussin A.C. control substance sheet for patient A. Price by failing to indicate on the copy the destruction of the original and failing to obtain a co-signature on the copy.

The Board determined that these allegations were true. The respondent failed to indicate on the copy that the original Robitussin A.C. controlled substance sheet was destroyed and that this was a copy. There was no co-signature on the copy. The respondent asked staff nurses to sign their names on the recopied sheet next to the dosage and time they allegedly had given the medication.

In pertinent part, Section 20-99(b) forbids incompetence or negligence in carrying out usual nursing functions.

Standards of nursing practice require accurate record-keeping of all medications ordered and administered. The respondent proceeded to recopy a medical document in a manner which is not in keeping with standards of nursing practice.

Based on the foregoing, the Board concludes that the respondent has violated section 20-99(b) as specified in the Fifth Count.

ORDER

9. It is the unanimous decision of those of the Board of Examiners for Nursing who were present and voting that:

- a. The license of the respondent be suspended for a minimum period of 6 months determined as follows:
 - i. as to the Third Count, suspension for a period of 6 months;
 - ii. as to the Fifth Count, suspension for a period of 6 months
 - iii. the suspensions specified for the Third and Fifth Counts are to run concurrently.
- b. The said period of suspension shall commence on June 1, 1985 and shall run until December 1, 1985.

10. The respondent, Jeanne Surprenant, is hereby directed to surrender her license and current registration to the Board of Examiners for Nursing at 150 Washington Street, Hartford, Connecticut, 06106 on or before June 1, 1985.
11. The Board of Examiners for Nursing herewith advises the Department of Health Services of the State of Connecticut of this decision.

Dated at Hartford, Connecticut, this
day of May 20, 1985.

BOARD OF EXAMINERS FOR NURSING

BY: Emilia A. Mascaro R.N.

Emilia Mascaro, RN, MS